

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM CHAMBERLAIN,
Plaintiff,

v.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION,
Defendant.

No. 2:24-cv-00966-DAD-CKD (PS)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING
THIS ACTION

(Doc. Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13, 15)

Plaintiff William Chamberlain proceeds *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil action initiated on March 29, 2024 against the Federal Election Commission (“FEC”). This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On April 28, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that this action be dismissed, without leave to amend, due to plaintiff’s failure to establish this court’s subject matter jurisdiction and failure to state a claim. (Doc. No. 15.) As to jurisdiction, the magistrate judge observed that plaintiff seeks judicial review under 52 U.S.C. § 30109(a)(8) of the FEC’s alleged failure to act on or investigate plaintiff’s administrative complaint filed against Chase Manhattan Bank and Donald Trump, but “[e]xclusive jurisdiction for this claim is vested in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.” (Doc.

1 No. 15 at 3.) As to plaintiff's claims under the First and Fourteenth Amendment, the magistrate
2 judge noted that "[p]laintiff has not pled that there is a waiver of sovereign immunity." (*Id.* at 3–
3 4.) Further, the magistrate judge also found that plaintiff's first amended complaint "does not
4 contain a short and plain statement of a claim" and does "not allege[] sufficient facts to show that
5 the FEC violated his rights." (*Id.* at 4.) In light of these findings, the magistrate judge
6 recommended that plaintiff's first amended complaint be dismissed and also recommended that
7 plaintiff's various pending motions, for summary adjudication, for summary judgment, to revoke
8 power of attorney, and for an extension of time to serve defendant, (Doc. Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13), be
9 denied as having been rendered moot. (Doc. No. 15 at 5.) The pending findings and
10 recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were
11 to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. (*Id.* at 5–6.) To date, no objections have been
12 filed, and the time in which to do so has passed.

13 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a
14 *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the
15 findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.

16 Accordingly,

- 17 1. The findings and recommendations issued on April 28, 2025 (Doc. No. 15) are
18 ADOPTED in full;
- 19 2. Plaintiff's first amended complaint (Doc. No. 9) is DISMISSED, without leave to
20 amend, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and for failure to state a claim;
- 21 3. Plaintiff's motion for summary adjudication (Doc. No. 10), motion for summary
22 judgment (Doc. No. 11), motion to revoke power of attorney (Doc. No. 12), and
23 motion for an extension of time to serve defendant (Doc. No. 13) are DENIED as
24 having been rendered moot; and

25 /////

26 /////

27 /////

28 /////

4. The Clerk of the Court is directed to **CLOSE** this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **July 2, 2025**

Dale A. Drozd
DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE